IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3217 of 2000

to

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATIONNo 3226 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.R.TRIPATHI

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : YES

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

PARMAR MAHENDRKUMAR MANUBHAI

Versus

COLLECTOR

Appearance:

MR IS SUPEHIA for Petitioner

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.R.TRIPATHI

Date of decision: 25/04/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

#. Mr.I.S.Supehia, the learned advocate for the petitioner. Mr.Digant Joshi, learned A.G.P. for

Mr.S.P.Hasurkar, learned Additional G.P. for the respondent.

#. Rule. With the consent of the parties the matter is taken up for final disposal.

#. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was selected in the year 1994, through the Employment Exchange and came to be appointed for election work. It is also the case of the petitioner that thereafter from time to time whenever there was election work, services of the petitioner were utilised i.e. in the year 1995-96 and 1998-99. The grievance of the petitioner is that this time though the election of Panchayats are declared by a resolution dated 31.1.2000 and the respondent authority ought to have utilised the services of the petitioner, they are not considering and therefore the petitioner is constrained to approach this court.

#. Mr.Digant Joshi, appearing for the respondent makes a statement that though the election for the present are postponed but as and when the election work will be under taken the case of the petitioner will be considered sympathetically in accordance with law and if there is nothing adverse to the petitioner, his services will be utilised on the same terms as in the past were utilised. In case the authority did not comply with the aforesaid statement it will be open to the petitioner to have recourse to the remedy available to them.

#. Mr.I.S.Supehia, learned advocate for the petitioner submits that in fact the petitioner has already made a representation on 1.4.2000 which may also be directed to be considered by the authority sympathetically and in accordance with law. The request is reasonable and hence is granted.

The authorities are directed to consider the representation of the petitioner within six weeks from the date of receipt of writ of this court. In view of the aforesaid statement the grievance of the petitioner does not survive for the present petition is accordingly disposed of. Rule stands discharged. With no order as to costs.

kks